

Remarks

Applicant requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 10, and 31-39 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 10, 31, 33, and 38 are the independent claims.

Claims 1, 10, 31, 33, and 38 have been amended. Applicant submits that support for the amendments can be found in the original disclosure, and therefore no new matter has been added.

Applicant appreciates the indication that Claims 33-34 and 38-39 are objected to but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 33 and 38 have been rewritten in independent form, and an indication that those claims are allowed is requested.

Claims 1, 3-4, 10, 31-32 and 35-37 stand rejected under 35.U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of U.S. Patent No. 5,613,048 (Chen, et al.), admitted prior art and U.S. Patent No. 5,327,257 (Hrytzak, et al.). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the reasons discussed below.

As recited in Claim 1, the present invention includes, *inter alia*, the feature of reading out ray space data from a recording unit according to a set sampling rate, and reconstructing an image of a virtual space, the read out ray space data being arranged on a line in the ray space, and being on the line at an interval in accordance with the sampling rate. Due to this feature, the resolution of an image reconstructed based on the read out ray space data may be changed according to the sampling rate. Independent Claims 10 and 31 recite similar features.

Applicant submits that the cited art fails to disclose or suggest at least the above-mentioned feature. In particular, Applicant submits that in Chen, et al. the resolution of an image (which is obtained by morphing processing) is always constant even if a sampling rate is changed. Moreover, the “sampling rate” described in Chen, et al. is determined in accordance with the number of times of generating an image along a time axis, and is therefore different from the sampling rate recited in the independent claims. Hrytzak, et al. merely discloses a technique for interpolation and does not disclose or suggest a “sampling rate” as recited in the independent claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that the present invention recited in Claims 1, 10, and 31 is patentable over the art of record.

The remaining dependent claims are believed patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims they depend from, as well as for the additional features they recite.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the above-mentioned Office Action, and an early Notice of Allowance are requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant
Brian L. Klock
Registration No. 36,570

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

BLK/lmj
DC_MAIN 146594